

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MARTELL JONES #701358,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 1:23-cv-410
v.)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
HEIDI WASHINGTON, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff Martell Jones’ objection to the August 16, 2024 report and recommendation. (ECF No. 44). Judge Green issued a report and recommendation that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted and this case be dismissed. (ECF No. 43). The court will adopt the report and recommendation over Plaintiff’s objection.

I.

Plaintiff filed this action against fifty individuals concerning events that occurred when he was incarcerated at the Ionia Correctional Facility (“ICF”). (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff alleged a variety of claims related to (1) denial of the opportunity to attend religious services; (2) denial of mail and food; (3) denial of medical care; (4) harassment; and (5) deprivation of due process in disciplinary proceedings. The report and recommendation suggests that Plaintiff’s remaining claims against Defendants Washington, McKee, Dawdy, Davids, Bonn, Ferguson, Dunigan, Maranka, Luther, Sanborn, Simon, and Smith be dismissed without prejudice for failure to exhaust administrative remedies and this action terminated. (ECF No. 43).

II.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). An “objection does not oblige the district court to ignore the report and recommendation.” *Pharmacy Recs. v. Nassar*, 465 F. App’x 448, 456 (6th Cir. 2012). Our Local Rules require any party objecting to a report and recommendation to “specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.” W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b); *see also Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (holding that “objections disput[ing] the correctness of the magistrate’s recommendation but fail[ing] to specify the findings . . . believed [to be] in error” are too general).

III.

The court has reviewed Plaintiff’s objections to the report and recommendation. Every one of Plaintiff’s objections is vague, and he fails to articulate any specific error in the report and recommendation. (ECF No. 44). Accordingly, his objections are summarily rejected. *See Pharmacy Recs.*, 465 F. App’x at 456; *Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the report and recommendation (ECF No. 43) is **ADOPTED** by the court. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 33) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's objection to the report and recommendation (ECF No. 44) is **DENIED**.

Judgment to follow.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 28, 2025

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge